

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/046,426	01/16/2002	Alexander Gurary	EMCORE 3.0-069	2965
530	7590 06/07/2004		EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST			MOORE, KARLA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WESTFIEL	D, NJ 07090		1763	
			DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
â	10/046,426	
Advisory Action	10/046,426 Examiner	GURARY ET AL.
	Karla Moore	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	e à	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	LICATION IN CONDITION FO oid abandonment of this appli a timely filed amendment whi (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	R ALLOWANCE. cation. A proper reply to a
_	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of ti (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set formater than SIX MONTHS from the mail. FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF date on which the petition under 37 C f extension and the corresponding amonthe shortened statutory period for replace later than three months after the months.	rigidate of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension are appropriate extension to the fee. The appropriate extension are appropriate extension.
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR).	FR 1.704(b). Brief must be filed within the p R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a) They raise new issues that would require furthe		(see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for r application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	use it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims wou	s) a)∏ will not be entered or b ⊔ld be rejected is provided bek)∏ will be entered and an own or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		`
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appro	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement		
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	P. Hassonzeds primary Edaminer primary 1763

Continuation of 10. Other:

The declarations submitted have been used to pre-date a reference (Chiang) cited in rejections included in both the non-final and final rejections of the application. The declarations presented would have been relevant as of the non-final rejection. The affidavit will not be considered because good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented have not been shown.

Additionally, with respect to Applicant's argument that the combination of Tung and Chiang involves hindsight, Examiner disagrees. Tung teaches the missing feature and provides sound and rational reasoning why one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to provide cylindrical shutter with an internal temperature-regulating cavity extending completely around a wafer carrier in Chiang. The fact that the shutter of Chaing is movable does not discount this reasoning.